

Remarks/Arguments

The Applicant's attorney respectfully appreciates the telephone interview with the Examiner on May 26, 2005. During the telephone interview the Examiner indicated that the objection to claim 21 will be withdrawn. The Examiner also indicated a willingness to consider withdraw of the final rejection because Dischler et al. do not teach or suggest a coating comprising silicone rubber.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 12 that the air bag fabric includes "a static friction at the intersections between the warp and weft threads being present that is at least 5% greater than that of an untreated fabric having the same construction". Since the limitations of claim 12 were under consideration prior to the final action, amended claim 11 would not require an additional search. Therefore, a showing under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) is not believed to be needed.

Below is a discussion of the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 11, 2-10, 19-20, and 12 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,776,839 to Dischler et al. (hereinafter, "Dischler et al.").

35 USC §103 rejection of claims 11, 2-10, 19-20, and 12.

Claim 11 recites an airbag fabric comprising intersecting warp and weft threads made of at least one of synthetic fibers and filaments and woven at such a density that openings remaining between their intersections yield an at least microporous structure in the fabric. At least one of

crystalline and amorphous particles are incorporated in at least some of the openings. The fabric has a coating or finish of polymeric material that has been applied after the incorporation of at least one of crystalline and amorphous particles. The coating or finish comprises a silicone. The static friction at the intersections between the warp and weft threads being present that is at least 5% greater than that of an untreated fabric having the same construction.

Claim 11 is patentable over Dischler et al. because Dischler et al. do not teach or suggest an air bag fabric that includes (1) a coating or finish, which includes a silicone and (2) a static friction at the intersections between the warp and weft threads being present that is at least 5% greater than that of an untreated fabric having the same construction.

Dischler et al., as noted in the Office Action, teach an air bag fabric that is coated with a dilatant powder. The dilatant powder maintains or lowers the coefficient of friction of the fabric away from the point of impact. (Column 3, lines 60-65). The dilatant powder acts essentially as a lubricant allowing greater fiber or yarn mobility. (Column 4, lines 17-24).

Dischler et al. do not teach or suggest an air bag fabric that comprises a coating or finish, which includes silicone. The Examiner notes this on page 5, line 8 of the October 20, 2004 Office Action.

Dischler et al. also do not teach an air bag fabric that includes a static friction at the intersections between the

warp and weft threads being present that is at least 5% greater than that of an untreated fabric having the same construction. Moreover, as discussed above, Dischler et al. actually teach away from using a material that increases the friction of the fibers of the air bag. Dischler et al. teach that the dilatant powders reduce the coefficient of friction (Column 3, lines 60-61) of the fabric and act as a lubricant between fibers of the fabric (Column 4, lines 16-23). Whereas, the static friction is increased by the treatment of the present invention.

Therefore, Dischler et al. fail to teach all of the limitations of claim 11 and withdrawal of rejection of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9 and 19-20 depend from claim 11 are therefore allowable because of the aforementioned deficiencies in the rejection with respect to claim 11 and because the specific limitations recited in claims 2-9 and 19-20.

Claim 12 recites an airbag fabric that comprises intersecting warp and weft threads made of at least one of synthetic fibers and filaments and woven at such a density that openings remaining between their intersections yield an at least microporous structure in the fabric. At least one of crystalline and amorphous particles are incorporated in at least some of the openings. A static friction at the intersections between the warp and weft threads is present that is at least 5% greater than that of an untreated fabric having the same construction.

Claim 12 is patentable over Dischler et al. because Dischler et al. do not teach or suggest an air bag fabric that includes a static friction at the intersections between the warp and weft threads being present that is at least 5% greater than that of an untreated fabric having the same construction. Moreover, as discussed above, the Dischler et al. actually teach away from using a material that increases the friction of the fibers of the air bag. Dischler et al. teach that the dilatant powders reduce the coefficient of friction (Column 3, lines 60-61) of the fabric and act as a lubricant between fibers of the fabric (Column 4, lines 16-23). Whereas, the static friction is increased by the treatment of the present invention.

Therefore, Dischler et al. fail to teach all of the limitations of claim 12 and withdrawal of rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in  
the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account  
No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard A. Sutkus  
Reg. No. 43,941

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL  
& TUMMINO, LLP  
526 Superior Avenue - Suite 1111  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
(216) 621-2234  
(216) 621-4071  
Customer No.: 26294